

05-12-05

3732

TRANSMITTAL LETTER
(General - Patent Pending)

Docket No.

110/02242

In Re Application Of: Oren GLOBERMAN, et al

MAY 10 2005

Application No.	Filing Date	Examiner	Customer No.	Group Art Unit	Confirmation No.
09/890,318	July 25, 2001	PHLOGENE, P.	44909	3732	9263

Title: EXPANDABLE ELEMENT DELIVERY SYSTEM

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS:

Transmitted herewith is:

Response to Office Action dated February 10, 2005

in the above identified application.

No additional fee is required.

A check in the amount of _____ is attached.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge and credit Deposit Account No. 03-3419 as described below.

- Charge the amount of _____
- Credit any overpayment.
- Charge any additional fee required.

Payment by credit card. Form PTO-2038 is attached.

WARNING: Information on this form may become public. Credit card information should not be included on this form. Provide credit card information and authorization on PTO-2038.

Paul Fenster

Signature

Dated: May 10, 2005

Paul FENSTER Reg. No. 33,877

William H. Dippert, Esq.
Reed Smith LLP
599 Lexington Avenue, 29th Floor
New York, NY 10022-7650

Tel: (212) 521-5450

cc:

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the "Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)] on _____.

(Date)

Signature of Person Mailing Correspondence

Typed or Printed Name of Person Mailing Correspondence



PTO/SB92 (08-00)

Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0651-0031

U. S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it contains a valid OMB control number.

Certificate of Express Mail Under 37 CFR 1.10

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service Express Mail under 37 CFR 1.10 on the date indicated below and is addressed to:

Mail Stop:
Commissioner For Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

May 10, 2005

on _____

Date

EV302916331US

Express Mail Label

William H. Dippert

Docket No.: 501010.20700

Reed Smith LLP
599 Lexington Avenue
29th Floor
New York, New York 10022-7650
Telephone: 212-521-5400; Facsimile: 212-521-5450

Note: Each paper must have its own certificate of mailing, or this certificate must identify each submitted paper.

Applicant: Oren Globerman, et al.
Serial No: 09/890,318
Filing Date: July 15, 2001
For: EXPANDABLE ELEMENT DELIVERY SYSTEM
Enclosures: (1) Transmittal [2 pages];
(2) RESPONSE [3 pages];
(3) PTO-1449s [8 sheets];
(4) Acknowledgement Postcard.

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 0.03 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U. S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.

110/02242 A07

MAY 10 2005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Oren GLOBERMAN et al.

Serial No : 09/890,318

Filed : July 25, 2001

For : EXPANDABLE ELEMENT DELIVERY SYSTEM

Examiner : Pedro PHILOGENE

Group Art Unit: 3732

Mail Stop Amendment
Honorable Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE

Sir:

This letter is in response to an Office Action dated February 10, 2005, in the above referenced application. The present application includes claims 1-89 and 100-173. Claims 73-89 and 100-173 were allowed.

In the following discussion applicants relate to independent claim 1. The dependent claims are allowable at least by virtue of their parent claim.

Claims 1-8, 11, 12, 15, 17, 18, 22, 34, 35, 37, 39, 40, 42, 47-49, 58 and 68 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Bachmann et al. (5,759,186). Claims 43-46, 59, 60 and 63-67 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bachmann et al. (5,759,186). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and state that the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of unpatentability, as Bachmann lacks at least one limitation of the claim.

Claim 1 requires a force application mechanism for applying a deforming force to the implant, by axial motion of a force applicator against the implant. This is not taught or suggested by Bachmann, which teaches a stent 33 which is expanded by retraction of an outer tube 9, which holds the implant in a compressed form (col. 6, lines 51-64). The axial motion applied by Bachmann is used for axial displacement of the outer tube relative to the central tube (col. 1, lines 61-63) and is not applied against the implant, as required by claim 1.